



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

what is to hinder the remaining *i* or *j* from exerting a further influence on the consonant after which it stands? This is exactly what occurs in the West Germanic dialects in such cases as A.-S. *\*banjāz* > *\*benja* > *benna*; *\*satjan* > *\*setjan* > *settan*; *\*racjan* > *\*recjan* > *reccan*; and still more strikingly in Old Saxon *settian*, *reccian*.

The spurious diphthong is discussed under the following heads: First, *ei* from compensative lengthening; second, *ei* < *ε* under the ictus; third, *ei* derived from *ε* + an *i* developed in certain cases before vowels; fourth, *ei* arising from contraction of *εε*.

Dr. Smyth's treatise is a most welcome contribution to the scientific study of grammar, and shows the praiseworthy tendency of recent investigations to deal with minute points and collect, as far as possible, complete material as the only sure basis for satisfactory theories. A favorable review of Dr. Smyth's work by Gustav Meyer may be found in the *Berliner Wochenschrift*, 31 July, 1886.

J. H. K.

The Roots and Stems of Words in the Latin Language Explained and Illustrated with Examples. By JOHN WENTWORTH SANBORN, A. M. Albion, N. Y., Published by the Author, 1886.

This little pamphlet, of barely ten pages, is designed to throw light on the difference between roots and stems, and to furnish a guide to teachers and pupils. It seems to us to throw very little light, and often to lead astray. The writer's lack of sound linguistic training is everywhere evident. On the very first page we are told that the word *ēs-sē* has the root *ēs*, and this is also its stem. It is certainly time that a long-mark over a vowel should mean simply that the vowel itself is long. In *rex*, king, *rēg* is said to be the verbal root designating an *object*. Here the difference between *rēg* and *rēg* of *regere* is certainly not made clear. Nor is there much illumination in the following sentences: "A few examples of pronominal roots will illustrate: *mē* in *mei*, *tū* in *tuī*, and such remains of pronominal roots as *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, *ie*." "*Iūdicis* is such a word; its compounded roots are *in* and *dic* (from *ius* and *dico*)."  
 "The stem of *principes* is *princeps*," "The root of *gēnu* is *gon*; the stem is *genu*." "The stem of *hic* is *hō*; if the enclitic *ne* is added *ce* (*cī*) appears; as *hiccine*." "The stem of *illē* is *illō*, or an old form *ollō*." Finally, the root of *bibo* is said to be *bo* or *bib*. In the face of these and other statements, which it is superfluous to mention here, we humbly beg leave to differ from the opinion of "several distinguished instructors," who, according to the writer's preface, examined the manuscript and thought it would prove "no sacrifice of thoroughness."

M. W.

Ovid, *Tristia*, Book I. The Text Revised, with an Introduction and Notes, by S. G. OWEN, B. A. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1885. Pp. lxiv, 115.

This book, as the editor announces, is only an instalment of a larger commentary on the complete *Tristia*, which is in preparation. It can hardly be denied that Ovid has received of late less attention from scholars than he deserves. Robinson Ellis has given us a learned edition of the *Ibis*, contributing much to its elucidation, and the idea of the edition before us seems to have been suggested by him. As the last commentary to the *Tristia* was that of

Lörs, in 1839, a more modern commentary was sorely needed. For the constitution of the text, Owen has collected new materials, in using which he has shown himself very conservative, giving little room to conjectural emendation.

For many of the statements in the introduction he acknowledges his indebtedness to recent German dissertations. The life of Ovid is given at length, with copious foot-notes referring to the authorities. The works of Ovid are briefly described in the order of their chronological sequence. Book V of the *Tristia* is assigned to the spring of A. D. 12, in opposition to the view of Graeber, who puts it at the end of 11 A. D. A long section is devoted to the friends and patrons of Ovid addressed in the *Tristia* and Pontic epistles. It is assumed that the persons addressed in the two collections are substantially the same, although in the *Tristia* the names were suppressed. To the settlement of the vexed question as to the cause of Ovid's banishment nothing new is added, the view followed being in the main that of Gaston Boissier. In a chapter on the literary value of the *Tristia*, an attempt is made to reply to some of the strictures which have been passed upon them, especially to Macaulay's charge of pusillanimity and impatience. Certain faults of form are admitted, and attributed to lack of pruning, to rhetorical exuberance, and the imitation of the Alexandrine school. The section on the MSS ought certainly to be expanded in the complete edition. Owen has made an independent collation of the Marcianus (L), the most important MS, and has collated for the first time a MS belonging to the Earl of Leicester, at Holkham Hall, Norfolk (H). Of the Vaticanus (V) a careful collation was made for him by Mr. Monaci. G, already well known (Guelferbytanus), H, and V, he considers to be of equal value, although he gives no proof of this statement. They are of the same class with L, and are used to supplement it. Occasional references are also made to a Bodleian MS of the fifteenth century, and a thirteenth-century MS at Arras. We have noted fourteen passages where Owen follows the reading of L, or of the better MSS, where Güthling has deserted them. In II 91 he keeps *corpora*, against the plausible *carbasa* adopted by Riese and Güthling. In X 24 he keeps *reliquit*, which had been set aside by previous editors in favor of *relegit*, and puts verses 25, 26 after 27, 28. In V 35 *rebus succurrite laevis* is supported by Silius XI 6. In III 97, following HV, he reads *nataeque virique*; but may not *vir* have come from the line above, and is not *nataeque meumque* of G $\lambda$  to be preferred? Güthling reads with Merkel *nataeque meumve*. To decide this question we need a more complete conspectus of the kind of errors common to HV than is afforded by this one book. In IV 23, by a typographical error, Güthling is made to read both *revelli* and *repelli*. In IX 35 Owen ingeniously conjectures *esto et iam miseris pietas*; but Roby, in a note given in Appendix, p. 109, is inclined to defend the reading of the MSS, *est etiam*, as a reminiscence of Verg. Aen. I 462, *Sunt lacrimae rerum*. It may be noted here that in the commentary hardly enough attention has been paid to Vergilian parallels, although several reminiscences are pointed out. The notes, as a whole, are very clear and thorough, and much light is thrown by judicious translations. In VII 33, where *libelli* is defended, no mention is made of Birt's objection (*Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 30) to the use of *libellus* for a complete work in several *libri*. Birt proposes to read either *primi* or *libellis*. We trust that the complete edition of the *Tristia* will not be long delayed.

M. W.